His ltr under PM II

11/29/69

Dear Dick,

I'll read the first part of your Finck commentary as I answer your letter of the 23rd, which arrived yesterday and which I was able to scan briefly then. A letter from Howard illustrates how important it can be for me to have the comments of others, for he has what I believe is a rather certain case of perjury by Frazier that I now do not recall whether I spotted or not. One thing like this can be very important and there is always the chance one of us will miss it. Howard is more than impressive for his years. And in some areas his youth is a decided asset.

On the Long citation, I would like that chapter and a precis of Helpern's comment on him, but there is no rush. That is very much in point. Have you a similar standard source on the velocity on breakup, that 2500 fps is the lowest speed at which it can be expected in such a bullet?

F 12-interesting point on width. Correct on finger-probing before he got there. 14&17 Add that F also swore he looked carefully and saw no sign of any wound, either entrance or exit. At one point he is quiteexplicit, saying he examined the edges. 15 This evasion had been employed earlier, in their 1966 rpt. 16. Correct. It is Humes testimony that what Finck ordered was Xrays of the extremities only (In PM III)....22 Another of his skilled evasions. He'd interpret, if pressed, to mean his body was in this position, not his face... 47 I believe I have radiologists name. It us doubtful he reported "nothing" because tiny metal fragments are like beacons in X-rays....48 Part of the reason Burkley's name is never mentioned is known if you recall what I have shown you. There is more I now have....48 I think the Army General may well have been the one in charge of the funeral. I think F was throwing curves here. That general may well have said he was in charge of the body and what happened to it. I think the man who really is responsible for this is Kinney, with Galloway's concurrence. This was the commander of the MDW, I think Wenle (IN PM)....50 When F actually got there is an interesting point, and in part it depends on when Humes called him, which we do not know, but if the decision was Humes', I'd expect it was not until after he saw the body. I think I've sent you copies of my letters to Howard on this.... 62 Not likely members, but certainly staff 64. The interesting think is that such a lie was told so early, if it was. If he was going on orders only, what compelled any explanation?...&i I think technically he avoids perjury because the mark may have been a little too low. Not much, butxas little....92 It is not only "evidently". Galloway was pretty much in charge, even when Specter interviewed them (PM)....99 Third person could have been Greer or Humes's second-hand sources....115 Is it not impossible that the family, which had not yet been together, could have indicated any desires? no matter how irrelevant to the law....That he did not consider it should be enough to lift his accreditation, for it was required in any autopsy. ...121 ff. The interesting thing is there is no indication of any microscopic examination of skin fro front of neck and there had to have been tissue removed. Thus we have no way of knowing whether, for example, there had been a slight error in which the back sample came from the front, etc. I have pretty much concluded that there is evidence a smaple was taken from the front. And there is no indication of this in supp. report....Lil has breakfast ready and I have to stop with this brevity. I have a large file I must complete by Monday a.m. and I am anxious to get what John asked of me done promptly. I'll file the letter under PM II and the Finck commentary on a file I have on his N.O. testimony, ~~xxfx~~ if we refer further to them...Finck would not have dared such testimony without some kind of official assurances. It is incredible, only like the Nazis. I think we have some possibilities of doing something about this in my coming suit.

Best,